BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 08528 838 7
7654.31
Research Library

No. M65H.31

GIVEN BY

Dr. H. P. Bowditch.

Dr. Th. P. Bowditch
BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
Jan. 30, 1902

Report of the Conference with the Mayor.

SHALL THE CITY OF BOSTON BUILD AND CONTROL THE PROPOSED WASHINGTON STREET SUBWAY?

.7654.31

House Bill 606, accompanying a petition of the Citizens' Association of Boston, providing for the construction of a subway under Washington Street, and the substitute therefor, presented upon petition of the Boston Associated Board of Trade, are soon to be acted upon by the Legislature.

The citizens of Boston felt that they could not afford to allow the so-called Citizens' Association bill to receive the approval of the Mayor and become a law without an earnest protest. Accordingly, a conference took place on Friday, May 18, at the City Hall, between His Honor Mayor Thomas N. Hart and representative business men of Boston who favored the substitute bill offered by the Associated Board of Trade. This organization has a substantial existence and includes in its membership men who are engaged in all lines of business and are fully conversant with the needs of Boston in respect to its transportation facilities. At a busy hour of the day, they left their occupations and their private affairs to impress upon the Mayor of Boston the necessity of presenting to the Legislature, as the official representative of the city, the opinion that *the proposed subway should be built and controlled by the city, and not handed over to a private corporation for a long term of years.* It was further urged that *whatever bill is passed, it should contain a referendum provision allowing the people of Boston to express, by vote, their views upon this important matter.*

Among the representative men present were :— L. D. Brandeis (counsel for the Boston Associated Board of Trade), William B. Rice (president New England Shoe and Leather Association),

Jerome Jones (former president Associated Board of Trade), L. G. Burnham (former president Associated Board of Trade), W. H. Lincoln (president Chamber of Commerce), J. Richard Carter (president Merchants' Association), E. G. Preston (secretary Chamber of Commerce), W. O. Blaney (former president Associated Board of Trade), Amos Towle (Teamsters' Association), Robert Boit (president Associated Board of Trade), Osborne Howes (secretary Board of Fire Underwriters), John T. Boyd (secretary Associated Board of Trade), John Shaw (president Chemical Association), George H. Leonard (vice-president Chamber of Commerce), William Craig (vice-president Fruit and Produce Exchange), Robert F. Edwards, Morton Prince, Andrew G. Webster, David L. Webster, B. W. Wadleigh, Laurence Minot, F. L. Higginson, Thornton K. Lothrop, George Hutchinson, W. B. Clarke, George H. Sargent, B. F. Keith, Henry W. Peabody, George M. Cushing, S. D. Warren, E. R. Warren, E. L. Sprague, Edward A. Filene, F. P. Sprague, Henry P. Bowditch, George B. Upham, Gordon Prince, John C. Haynes, John Shepard, John Hopewell, Albert Plummer.

THE TWO BILLS COMPARED.

Mr. Brandeis said, in opening:—

"The Harding bill, for the construction of the subway under Washington Street, provides in substance three things:

"*First.* That the Washington Street subway shall be built at the cost of the Boston Elevated Railway Company, to be its absolute property until 1937, and to remain its absolute property forever afterwards, unless, during the period of three years from 1937 to 1940, the city shall vote to purchase the same at its cost; and that the city is to receive no compensation whatever for the use of the subway, by way of rental or otherwise.

"*Second.* That the Cambridge Street subway shall also be built at the cost of the Boston Elevated Railway Company, upon the same terms and conditions as the Washington Street subway, thus abrogating the provisions of the present law, by which the Elevated Railway Company is obliged to take a lease of that subway, when built, at a rental sufficient to pay interest and sinking fund charges, and which would leave the ownership in the city free from all cost at the latest at the end of thirty-seven years.

"*Third.* The lease of the present subway, which expires August 31, 1917, shall be extended for the period of twenty years, — that is, until 1937, on the same terms under which it is now held.

"The Boston Associated Board of Trade, while favoring the construction of a subway under Washington Street, opposes these provisions of the Harding bill as being inimical to the public interests in this: It would in effect surrender to the Boston Elevated Railway Company for a period of more than a generation the control of the transportation system of the city of Boston, and would make this surrender without securing to the city any compensation, financial or otherwise.

"The Associated Board of Trade has offered a substitute bill, which contains in substance the following provisions: —

"1. That the Washington Street subway shall be constructed by the city of Boston and be its property.

"2. That the construction shall not be begun until (*a*) the city shall have obtained a lease from responsible parties, expiring at the same time as the lease of the present subway, at an annual rental of at least 4⅞ per cent. (*b*) That such lease shall have been approved by the citizens of Boston on submission of the same to them by a referendum.

"3. That the Boston Elevated Railway Company shall have until September 1, 1900, the exclusive option to take the lease of the subway on these terms.

"4. That, if the Elevated Railway Company does not elect before September 1, 1900, to take a lease of the Washington Street subway on the above terms, such lease, at a rental of not less than 4⅞ per cent. upon the cost, may be given to other parties, approved by the Railroad Commissioners. Such lease may be taken by any other street railway company now or hereafter organized under the Massachusetts law, with power to accept locations and operate a street railway within the city of Boston, but no corporation shall be accepted as such lessee which does not have a cash capital and net assets over all liabilities of at least one million dollars.

"The Board of Trade finds in the present condition of the city's finances the strongest reason for opposing the Harding bill and urging upon the Legislature the passage of an act which will enable the city to get a full return from such assets as it pos-

sesses. Among its most valuable assets is the right to its streets. From this right the city may expect in the future a large return. The substitute bill proposed by the Associated Board of Trade is so framed, it is believed, as to fully protect the city from all loss, and to secure to it all such benefit. The Board of Trade further believes that an act vitally affecting the welfare of the citizens of Boston should not go into force until it has been sanctioned by a vote of the people, and the bill therefore provides for a referendum. This is in line with the repeatedly declared policy of your honor, that the citizens of Boston should be allowed to determine matters affecting the city's welfare."

THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE.

In presenting to the Legislature the petition which follows, we ask you to consider some facts stated by **Mr. Edward A. Filene,** who presented it to the Mayor. Mr. Filene said: —

"In order to be sure that the position which we have taken was one generally held, we have caused to be circulated a petition, chiefly among the business men and entirely among the taxpayers of Boston. *This petition has been circulated for only three days. It was placed in circulation Tuesday morning, and was circulated Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday.* As a result of this petition being in circulation for three days, we have 1,700 names appended. The general report of the men was that the larger part of the persons approached signed very willingly, and that, of a very few who refused to sign at first, some signed afterwards, when the men had come back for explanations and had carried the explanations to these persons."

THE PETITION.

To the Honorable, the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts: —

We the Undersigned, taxpayers of the city of Boston, respectfully represent that, in our opinion, it is for the best interests of the city that the Washington Street subway should be built by the city and

leased on terms like those of the present Tremont Street subway. We further respectfully petition that any bill respecting the construction of a Washington Street subway be submitted to a vote of the people.

Laurence Minot,
F. L. Higginson,
Morton Prince,
Osborne Howes,
W. B. Clarke,
George B. Upham,
F. P. Sprague,
John Hopewell,
John Shepard,
Shepard, Norwell & Co.,
William Filene & Sons,
A. Shuman & Co.,
Noyes Bros.,
Gilchrist & Co.,
Chandler & Co.,
B. Sommer & Co.,
Meyer, Jonasson & Co.,
L. P. Hollander & Co.,
Conrad & Co.,
Byron E. Bailey,
S. Cohen & Co.,
William S. Butler & Co.,
J. G. Small & Co.,
P. F. Bonney & Sons,
Thomas O'Callaghan & Co.,
F. Vorenberg & Co.,
Edward Kakas & Sons,
N. G. Wood & Sons,
Arthur A. Glines,
John J. Whipple,
E. B. Hall & Co.,
Thomas F. Galvin,
B. F. Keith,
Henry W. Peabody,
Louis D. Brandeis,
H. P. Bowditch,
S. D. Warren,
L. G. Burnham,
William H. Lincoln,
Horace W. Wadleigh,
Franklin Hayes,
Robert J. Edwards,
John C. Haynes,
Henry W. Tuttle Co.,
Simpson & Co.,
W. H. Fernekees,
C. W. Emerson,
T. D. Whitney & Co.,
Melvin & Badger,
Wallace L. Pierce,
Charles H. C. Brown,
The Macmillan Co.,
Alland Bros.,
Jackson & Co.,
John J. Ray,
George Wright,
March Bros.,
Pierce & Co.,
G. R. Fisk & Co.
Bradstreet, Tilton & Co.,
William Bloom & Co.,
William H. Richardson & Co.,
W. G. Hall,
Gilbert, Brooks & Tebbutt,
Thomas Long Co.,
Mason & Snow,
Brown, Durrell & Co.,
Langley, Burr & Co.,
Lovett, Hart & Phipps,
M. Larrabee,
Jarvis Lamson,
James H. Stetson,
W. P. Sargent & Babcock,
Chick Bros.
Jacob Dreyfus & Sons,
Hawley, Folsom & Ronimus,
Simons, Hatch & Whitten Co.,
Cutting & Wells,
John W. Pettingill,
E. W. Tyler (Knabe Piano Co.),
Dexter, Pond & Co.,
Keep Mfg. Co.,
Gardner & Osgood,
Hagop Bogigian & Co.,
C. E. Goodspeed,
Hill & Hill,
Heyer Bros.,
Bird Chemical Co.,
Bushrod Morse,
Dodge Bros.,
Finneran & Pollard,
M. R. Warren Co.,

Gorham D. Gilman,
Horace Partridge,
Faulkner, Page & Co.,
Dennison Mfg. Co.,
Clifton Mfg. Co.,
Methodist Book Concern,
Jones, McDuffee & Stratton,
David M. Webster,
Andrew G. Webster,
Parker, Holmes & Co.,
Batchelder & Lincoln Co.,
Atlas Shoe Co.,
Jacobs, Whitcomb Co.,
John Carter & Co.,
Parker, Wilder & Co.,
London Harness Store Co.,
Adams, Cushing & Foster,
Spaulding & Co.,
David Loring,
John J. Stevens,
The Walker-Rintels Co.,
W. B. Crocker,
Houghton & Clark,
Lee L. Powers Co.,
Lyman A. Bowker Co.,
C. F. Kirtland & Co.,
Hazelton, Goddard & Kitfield,
V. Ballard & Sons,
C. J. Bailey & Co.,
Bigelow Carpet Co.,
F. A. Folsom & Co.,
Cable Rubber Co.,
R. A. Stranahan,
Andreas Tomfohrde,
Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co.,
John A. Hooper,
A. H. Foster & Co.,
Dexter W. Bird,
Denny, Rice & Benedict,
F. A. Varney,
Libbey, Parker & Co.,
Charles J. Nichols,
Eisemann Bros.,
A. R. Bush,
Isaac M. Slocum,
W. E. Thayer,
Frederic Badow,
John Ross,
Solis & Co.,
John T. Lodge & Co.,
Winch Bros.,
Billings, Clapp & Co.,
Howes Bros.,
Kistler, Lesht Co.,
Bailey & Ayer,
H. B. Dillenback,
Choate & Brown,
Walker, Young & Co.,
Wetherbee & Whitney,
Lamkin & Foster,
Reynolds Oil Co.,
The Elastic Tip Co.,
Beach & Treiber Co.,
Caswell, Livermore & Co.,
W. S. Best & Co.,
Tileston & Livermore,
Wade & Deane,
American Glue Co.,
S. P. Blackburn & Co.,
Schultz Belting Co.,
Provident Trust Co.,
Howe & French,
Stetson, Foster & Co.,
Samuel Ward Co.,
Norman Cameron & Co.,
H. W. Patty & Co.,
William S. Appleton, Jr.,
J. C. Story & Co.,
Alexander S. Porter,
Alvin W. Whittier,
E. B. Newhall,
William E. Lincoln,
James P. Conroy,
Donner & Co. (Hamburg-American Line),
C. J. Tingg (North German Lloyd),
Alexander Martin (Cunard Line),
J. Frank Howland (Walter Baker Co.),
Jerome Jones (Jones, McDuffee & Stratton),
John Shaw,
C. H. Alford (Bliss, Fabyan & Co.),
The Alden Speare's Sons Co.,
R. Hollings & Co.,
and **1,550** others.

WHY THE CITY SHOULD BUILD.

Mr. Brandeis then called upon many of the representative business men present to express their views to His Honor Mayor Hart. **Mr. John Richard Carter,** president of the Boston Merchants' Association and vice-president of the Associated Board of Trade, thus stated the case: —

"On the main proposition before us there is no essential difference of opinion. It is generally believed that an additional subway, under Washington Street, would not only relieve present congestion, but in the future, when the volume of travel through our streets will be greatly augmented, it will become a necessity. The divergence of views begins with the consideration of the manner of carrying out the proposition.

"The bill of the Citizens' Committee provides that the subway be built under the supervision of the Rapid Transit Commission, but practically by the Elevated Railroad, paid for by them and owned by them, with no element of compensation to the community for the valuable franchise enjoyed, and which franchise becomes perpetual unless the city, after a lapse of about thirty-seven years, within a period of three years, votes to purchase the subway at practically cost.

"Nor does this tell the whole story, for the Elevated Railroad does not even enter into this compact, so favorable to itself, unless granted a release from legal obligations which it is now under to the city, viz., a release from its obligation to lease the Cambridge subway on the same terms as the Tremont Street subway.

"That this is an important concession to the Elevated is evident from the fact that the Citizens' Committee tell us it is impossible to make a new lease with them for any new subway on any such favorable terms to the city.

"But the city is not yet through with its concessions to induce the Elevated to accept a valuable franchise for nothing; it must extend the lease of the present subway twenty years, although the present lease does not expire until 1917.

"This, the Citizens' Committee tell us, should go on the other side of the account, — that it is something they successfully wrested from the Elevated. We do not agree with them nor appreciate their success. We fail to see the business sagacity of leasing, years in advance, at present rental, a property which may be worth more, but which we claim cannot be worth less.

"They tell us methods of transportation may change and the city be left, at the expiration of the present lease, with a subway only partially paid for. The suggestion as a business proposition is so unreasonable that it is without weight. Transportation in a great city must be in one of three ways, — surface road, elevated road, or underground road. The surface road we are trying to remove as far as practicable, as the most necessary step for relief in the so-called congested district. The elevated road also, in the same congested district, with its narrow streets, would be a menace to real estate values, and would in rightful self-protection be opposed by that powerful interest. The subway is the logical and practical solution for the future for transportation through the heart of great cities. With the subway half paid for by the sinking fund, at the end of the lease, with the growth of volume of transportation at that time, a new lessee can easily be found at the same, if not a better, price, if the present lessee does not desire to continue, unless in the meantime the city has bound itself by an ill-advised contract, by which it shall have practically surrendered its valuable rights in its streets, necessary to rapid transit, to a monopoly.

"In the future the subways will control the situation as regards rapid transit in the city; and, if we are to look to the interests of its citizens, we should see to it that the power to regulate their use and insure a proper financial return to the community remains vested in the city, while the interests of tenants leasing the same are safeguarded by leases, at reasonable rental and of reasonable length.

"What are the advantages to the city of the bill of the Citizens' Association? Simply this, that the city is not called upon to loan its credit for forty years on five or six millions of dollars, as it would have to do if it builds the subway.

"But, if the city can do this not only without risk, but at an actual cash profit of five or six million dollars, it ceases to be an advantage, and the advocates of the bill are left without a single argument in its favor."

A SAFE BUSINESS PROPOSITION.

"It is an absolutely safe business proposition. What private individual would not gladly enter into a business in which a constantly increasing volume of traffic was guaranteed to him? Yet,

that is just what is assured to a transportation company by the increase of travel in a great and growing city. Any change in motive power will be in the direction of economy, for such is the tendency of the times, and will accrue to the benefit of the leasing corporation.

"Any reduction in rates of interest will be to its advantage, for it will not affect its receipts, while it will effect a saving in interests paid, as from time to time it refunds its bonds at lower rates. With such business conditions, there is no danger of default in payment on the part of the lessee, nor of consequent loss to the city.

"Instead of being blindly alarmed at the great debt of the city, it is time the public carefully analyzed it, to see what it means and where retrenchment should be made. Debts incurred for running expenses or for those things of use and enjoyment, like schoolhouses and parks, from which there is no financial return, but which must be ultimately paid by the taxpayer, even though in part the time is temporarily put off by loans, should be kept as low as possible. These are of the class of debts which are a menace to the prosperity of the city, if the amount of them is in undue proportion to our ability to pay with reasonable taxation.

"But debts incurred for income-bearing property, where the income not only takes care of the interest but establishes a sinking fund that eventually pays for the property and makes it a valuable asset of the city, as is the case with our water debt and our present subway debt, are not a menace, but are good business investments, to the results of which we shall look in time, if we are wise, for income to be applied to our running expenses.

"I shall take but a few moments to speak of the advantages of the Associated Board of Trade bill, for the strongest argument I can make is to place them in contrast with the disadvantages of the bill of the Citizens' Association.

"We wish to build the subway.

"We do not antagonize the Elevated Railroad, but desire to have them lease the proposed subway on same terms as their present lease, giving them the first privilege.

"If the Elevated Railroad refuse to accept the lease, a responsible company of $1,000,000 capital, subject to approval of the Railroad Commissioners, will agree to take it, and the city is subject to no risk until such company is formed.

"The Associated Board of Trade bill provides that the city shall actually own the subway at the end of thirty-seven years, a subway fund derived from income extinguishing all the bonds, without one cent of the taxpayers' money being required.

"Now as to the contrast. The bill of the Citizens' Association provides that, at the expiration of the same time, the city may purchase the subway and incur a debt of five or six million dollars.

"In other words, Boston, with its splendid credit, pay five or six million dollars for the privilege of deferring a debt for forty years. We certainly hope the financial affairs of our city will not be conducted in so penny-wise a manner as this.

"We appeal to his honor, the mayor, to carefully consider the true interests of the city, before giving the weight of his influence to so costly a scheme as the Citizens' bill.

"We appeal to the members of the Legislature, with whom rests the final decision, not to inflict such a loss upon us as would be entailed by the Citizens' bill, but to approve the bill of the Associated Board of Trade, which reserves to the city the control of its great transportation system, and will leave us, if our own bill should become a law, with five or six million dollars less of debt at the end of forty years than we should have if the Citizens' bill is saddled upon us.

"If they are not clear in their minds as to what are the real wishes of the taxpayers of Boston, we most earnestly urge them to attach the referendum to whichever bill it may seem best to them to approve."

THE SENTIMENT OF BUSINESS MEN.

Individual opinions may differ, but on the main point of the substitute for the Citizens' Association bill — that the city should own the proposed subway — all the business men who appeared before the Mayor of Boston at this hearing were agreed. **Mr. Laurence Minot,** who represents large property interests and is a heavy taxpayer, thus expressed the sentiment of those present with respect to the duty of the Mayor: —

"We are all familiar with the opinion which you entertain with regard to the subway, and we do not come here with any idea of inducing you to change your opinion, which we recognize

as the result of many years' experience with the affairs of the city. We do come here to urge upon you that you are called upon to express an opinion as the official representative of the city of Boston. We have no doubt that the committee of the Legislature, in consulting you in this matter, desires not only to know your personal opinion, to which they will very properly attach great weight, but also to know the wishes of the citizens of Boston generally. We have, therefore, asked these gentlemen to come here this morning as representative citizens, and, on behalf of various business organizations of the city, to inform you of the fact that a very large number of citizens, whose opinion is entitled to weight, believe that any subway which is built should be built by the city, and leased upon substantially the same terms as the Tremont Street subway. We urge upon you that it is your duty as Mayor of Boston to inform the Legislature of the existence of this opinion and of the character — the representative character — of the men who express it. We recognize that there are other prominent citizens whose opinion on the subject coincides with that which you personally entertain, and we recognize that a difference of opinion exists in the community. We recognize also the great importance of the whole matter. We do hope to influence not only your official but your personal opinion so far as to induce you to say to this committee of the Legislature that, in your opinion, any legislation authorizing new subways in Boston should be made to take effect only when ratified by the voters of the city at a municipal or special election. You are aware that all the gentlemen who are present here this morning are very busy men, and you know that they cannot afford to devote their time to public affairs except upon matters which they consider of great importance; and the fact that so many of them have taken the time and the trouble to come here this morning must make it evident to you that they are very much in earnest about this matter, and that they propose to use every legitimate effort to defeat any legislation for the building of this subway otherwise than by the city. We believe it is your duty to inform the committee of the Legislature of the existence of this sentiment among the business men of Boston."

"LOOK ON THIS PICTURE, AND ON THIS."

Dr. Morton Prince thus forcibly contrasted the financial conditions which would obtain after a term of years under each of the two bills: —

	CITIZENS' BILL.	ASSOCIATED BOARD OF TRADE BILL.
After 37 Years.	City will own nothing.	City will own a subway worth $4,000,000, which has cost it nothing.
After 74 Years.	City will own the subway free of cost, but will have received nothing in rentals.	City will own subway and will have received an annual income of about $200,000, or $7,400,000 in the 37 years.

"Consider these facts: —

"1. The Citizens' bill practically makes a gift of this franchise from the city to the railroad company for thirty-seven years. In other words, it gives away $200,000 a year.

"2. It is said by some that the city is too poor to afford to build the subway.

"Our contention is that the city is too poor to give away this valuable franchise, worth $200,000 a year or more. A poor city, like poor people, cannot afford to give away its resources. If the city is poor, the more reason to hold on to its income-producing rights.

"3. It is said that methods of transit may change.

"It is difficult to conceive of any change in the methods of transit that will not make two underground roads through the heart of the city valuable for some kind of travel, whether the method be by electricity, steam, hot air, liquid air or some other power.

"These subways can be rented for thirty-seven years; and, even if they prove useless at the end of this time, they will have cost the city nothing and we shall be none the poorer, though they be used as storage warehouses.

"4. As to the extension of the Tremont Street subway lease contained in the Elevated Railroad bill: —

"As a pure financial question, it may, though not admittedly, have something in its favor. But this is not purely a financial question. Even Mr. Harding has called attention to the grip which the Elevated Railroad has on the city. With the road owning the Washington Street subway and controlling, by a long-term lease, the Tremont Street subway, this grip will be well-nigh irresistible.

"5. The road has already threatened that, if it cannot have its own way and *own* the Washington Street subway, it will not lease it, the needs and convenience of the city notwithstanding.

"If the managers threaten this now, under present conditions, what will they do when they own practically both subways? The city has now a certain moral power, for it can, if it sees fit, with the grace of the Legislature, give other roads the right to do the service through the subways; but, with long-time leases, the power of control will be lost. No other corporation could live without the subways.

"Therefore, the city cannot afford to give up its possession of the subways for too long periods of time."

HARDING BILL ALLOWS STOCK WATERING.

One of the most serious defects in the House Bill 606 was pointed out by **Mr. Andrew G. Webster,** who said, in substance:—

"It is provided that the city, at the end of thirty-seven years, may within three years purchase the subway at cost, and also the elevated tracks, etc., that may be built upon the location; but there is no provision to retire the stock issued to pay for the property. If the city made the purchase, the railway would receive its money back, but the stock would still be out, and this transaction would be equivalent to watering the stock to the extent of several millions. It is a long way off, but that is a reason why care should be used in arranging details.

"There are other faults in the bill besides the general one, that so valuable a right should not be given away, but should be retained by the city.

"Why should the city have only three years in which to decide to purchase? Why not a perpetual right? Why should not this right begin as soon as the subway is built?

"The lease of the present subway should not be extended until very near the time that it expires, as it is too early to determine what its value will be in the second decade of the next century.

"This and Tremont Street subway being the best, no arrangement should be made for this one extending beyond the termination of the Tremont Street lease. In arranging for the use of this one, provision should be made for payment for the use of the two valuable ones that are now authorized to be built."

IS A DIVIDED CONTROL OF SUBWAYS DESIRABLE?

An important point, to which we ask the attention of the Legislature, was made by **Mr. F. L. Higginson,** who said: —

"The chances are, that within the next forty years, in place of having five miles of subway, we shall in all probability have forty miles. It is the only convenient way, the only cheap way, to extend the transportation service of the city, and, if it can be done at no cost to the city, it should be done. Now, I only want to suggest one thing, and that is, that, if the Elevated is going to build this new subway under Washington Street, the old one being owned by the city, it will mean that one company is to own one piece of the subway, perhaps another company another piece, and the city a third piece. Some years ago London's transportation facilities were in charge of twenty or thirty different corporations, and the facilities provided by them were very unsatisfactory. After a long while, it was decided to abolish all of these and have one uniform company. If the subways of this city are going to be run by different people, we shall have a great deal of trouble.

"There is one other thing that should be provided for when the subway is built in Washington Street, and that is the removal of the surface tracks. We have seen the benefit of the removal of the tracks from Tremont Street. No injury has been sustained by any one from the removal of those tracks that amounts to anything. Some of the tracks on Washington Street should be discontinued if the subway is built."

IN THE INTEREST OF TAXPAYERS.

That the sentiment of the Citizens' Association is not that of the majority of the business men of Boston is apparent. The views of **Mr. William H. Lincoln,** president of the Chamber of Commerce, representing Boston's largest commercial organization, are as follows: —

"It has been evident to the citizens for some time that a subway should eventually be constructed in Washington Street, to accommodate the citizens of Boston and of the suburban districts who come to Boston to transact business. The advantages of the existing subway on Tremont Street have already been apparent. The saving in time has been very great, and it has proved of immense value to all the people using the subway.

"I heartily concur in all the views that have been expressed in relation to the ownership of the subway. The Elevated Railway has already acquired a most valuable franchise. To realize this we have but to estimate the original cost of the present mileage of the railway and the present value of the stock. If that is done, it will be seen that there has been an enormous profit, due to the large increase of travel and the value of the franchise acquired. Now I believe, in the interests of the taxpayers of Boston, that this subway should be built and owned by the city, and that it should be leased upon the terms that have been named in the bill prepared by the Associated Board of Trade. It seems to me that the advisability of that is so clear and so evident to all thinking men that there can hardly be any controversy or disagreement upon that point. It is self-evident that it would be of great advantage to the city to build the subway upon the terms that have been proposed, and that it will be of disadvantage to the city to build it upon the terms of the other bill, prepared, probably, in the interests of the Elevated Road. I think that the clear, lucid and unanswerable statement that has been made by Mr. Carter should be sufficient to insure the passage and success of the bill that has been prepared by the Associated Board of Trade. It is in the interests of the city of Boston and in the interests of all its taxpayers."

NOT AN INCREASE OF DEBT.

Mr. Jerome Jones, a former president of the Associated Board of Trade, spoke as follows, in regard to the financial issues involved: —

"I want to say that I am in favor of another subway, and that I am in favor of its being built by the same method of financiering under which the present subway was built. I appreciate the excellence of the present management of the Boston Elevated Railway system. The public are well served by them, but I believe they are apt to be too greedy in what they ask for. I think they have a franchise and a business proposition that is not excelled in New England. I have always felt that the city should get more than it has out of the use of its streets.

"As to the increase of the city's debt, which is larger now than it should be, I do not regard this as an increase of its debt. It is an income debt. I was recently shown a table of the public debt of the different States in the United States, and I was amazed to see that the State of Massachusetts owes the largest debt of any State in the Union. But that debt is largely an income debt. It was incurred for the building of the Metropolitan Sewer system, for the Metropolitan Water system, and so on, and it will all come back into the State Treasury. I think that the State has been wise in lending its credit for those purposes. I believe that money will all come back, and that the Commonwealth will be more prosperous and happy. I think that the city, by building the subway in Washington Street, would not really be adding to its debt, but that it would be loaning its credit for a purpose which will bring back every dollar into its treasury, and that it will add greatly to its convenience, its happiness and really to its necessities. I believe the bill of the Associated Board of Trade is much better than the other bill, and that I should be sorry to see some of the features in the other bill made a law."

A RELIEF FROM CONGESTION.

Mr. George H. Leonard, vice-president of the Chamber of Commerce, directed the attention of the Mayor to the point that Boston has a duty to perform in its relation to the surrounding towns and cities. In presenting this view of the case, he said: —

"There is one matter which I consider as really the bone and sinew of the success of any city. I refer to what may be called the 'dock and warehouse' side of transportation in large cities, and especially in the city of Boston. Many of the people doing business in the city come from the suburbs in all directions, and

we find it necessary to furnish transportation for those individuals. In order to do that, we are obliged to provide surface railroads, and those railroads take up the narrow streets. These individuals coming into the city find an occupation in the large warehouses and large businesses, which in Boston, as you know, are growing very rapidly. In fact, for the last fifteen or twenty years, the merchants of Boston have put their shoulders to the wheel and have made a special effort to make Boston, which we all know now is the second largest port of the United States, attractive for shipping, both for imports and exports. We have built up a very large mercantile business. Now, to carry on that business successfully, we have got to have the use of our streets. This merchandise must be transferred from the warehouse to the steamers or the railroads, and it must be carried from the one place to the other on the surface of the streets. We cannot go underground and build a subway to carry merchandise. I therefore make this statement here, as I see that several of the honorable gentlemen of the Legislature are with us, that I hope they will consider this point, and that in whatever bill they pass there will be a provision included, that, when the subway is built, the surface tracks shall be removed.

"I am very heartily in accord with the provisions of the Associated Board of Trade bill, favoring the subway being built by the city of Boston upon the same terms as the present subway."

WILL THE COMPANY PAY FOR THE STREETS?

Mr. Amos Towle, president of the Master Teamsters' Association, in speaking of the relief that will come from the construction of the new subway, said :—

"Assuming that the Elevated Railway wants a subway under Washington Street and that the city of Boston wants a subway under Washington Street, then this proposition resolves itself, to my mind, simply to this : Is the Elevated Railroad willing to pay for this franchise for the use of our street? That is the only difference between the one proposition and the other — between the proposition brought forward by the Elevated Railroad Company and the proposition brought forward by the Associated Board of Trade. When the Tremont Street subway was built,

that railroad company was willing to lease it at 4⅞ per cent., which pays the interest on the bonds and provides a sinking fund. Now, it is evident that that was intended to be a payment or a tax for their franchise, of which they got a tenure for twenty-five years. They now come in and ask a tenure of this subway for thirty-seven years for nothing. That is the only point I see in which the propositions differ. It is for the citizens of Boston to decide now whether they are to continue to give away franchises, or whether they are to enforce the principle adopted in the building and leasing of the Tremont Street subway.

"But the matter which more particularly interests me is this matter of surface travel for merchandise. Perhaps the gentlemen here are all aware that with the construction of the Tremont Street subway you even further congested the merchandise district. Tremont Street and Washington Street, you know, originally carried all the passenger traffic. That traffic became so congested that you were compelled to build a subway under Tremont Street to relieve this congestion. Previous to that, the passage of travelers had been too largely through the wholesale merchandise district. The building of the Tremont Street subway has relieved that not one single iota, but has increased it; for, if you could find out the facts definitely, you would find that there are three cars now passing through this merchandise district here on the surface to one that was passing through before the Tremont Street subway was built. Now, this proposition that comes from the Citizens' Association proposes to build what? Two tracks. They say you can build either two or four tracks, but the proposition as it is written, as it is spoken of, and as it is discussed, is simply to get the passengers of the Elevated Road through the city. They do not mean to take off any of the surface travel. They do not mean to take off a single surface car at all. Here are 100,000 tons of freight, and we have only a thirty-foot street and a sixteen-foot street in which to carry it, and here are lines upon lines of cars passing through the little, narrow streets, blocking up this traffic. Now then, the building of the subway under Washington Street is not going to relieve it in the least. If the gentlemen of the Legislature are going to give us a bill, let us have in that bill a provision that out of this merchandise district these surface tracks shall be removed. Atlantic Avenue should come in in some way. Very soon there will be an elevated

structure over Atlantic Avenue in operation. By the placing of this elevated structure there, you make it practically impossible for it to provide proper accommodation for the large amount of merchandise which collects along the wharves and which has got to be moved. It is absolutely certain that the city will find itself in a most deplorable condition if the surface tracks are not required to be removed when this bill is passed — if any bill is passed.

"I am in accord with the Associated Board of Trade bill, with this addition, that these surface tracks shall be taken up."

CORPORATIONS SHOULD PAY FOR USE OF STREETS.

Mr. John Hopewell, Jr., expressed the growing conviction that the city should receive pay from the corporations which use its streets and have exceptional privileges therein, as follows: —

"Without any antagonism toward the Boston Elevated Railway Company, I desire to express my firm conviction that the subway to be built under Washington Street should be built at the expense of the city. I say this on the grounds that I believe the Boston Elevated Railway Company can well afford to pay interest to the city of Boston on the expense of building this subway, sufficient to recompense the city for the bonded indebtedness incurred in its building; and, in addition to that, the fund that in thirty years would pay for the building of the subway, at which time it should be owned by the city, free of expense.

"In my opinion, the day has gone by when any city should give away valuable franchises of its streets. Corporations having the benefit of these franchises should be made to pay a reasonable compensation for same.

"Each generation is demanding of the cities more expense in the way of parks, recreation-grounds and amusements generally, which, I believe, is in the right line; but, to meet these added expenses and not overburden the taxpayers, it is only fair that corporations using our streets should pay a fair remuneration for the great privileges granted them; and, on these grounds, I am decidedly of the opinion that the city of Boston should build the subway and lease it to the railroad on the terms substantially as stated."

CUMULATIVE TESTIMONY.

Views similar to the foregoing were expressed by other gentlemen present. In addition to those whose sentiments have already been expressed, the Mayor was addressed by **Mr. John Shepard**; **Mr. W. O. Blaney,** of the Boston Chamber of Commerce; **Mr. William B. Rice,** president of the Boston Shoe and Leather Association; **Mr. Robert A. Boit,** president of the Associated Board of Trade; **Mr. Osborne Howes,** secretary of the Boston Board of Fire Underwriters; **Mr. Andrew G. Webster**; **Mr. John T. Boyd,** secretary of the Boston Associated Board of Trade; **Mr. W. B. Clarke** and others. **Mr. Shepard** said: —

"I thoroughly indorse the petition that has been read. I should not only like to see this subway built, but I should like to see one more thing done. I should like to see it managed by the same men and done in the same way as the subway in Tremont Street, which was built for less than the amount appropriated for it. That is the only case of anything of that kind that I know of. I would like to see it done over again in Washington Street."

Mr. John T. Boyd, secretary of the Boston Associated Board of Trade, advocated the building of the proposed subway by the city of Boston, through the Rapid Transit Commissioners, on the ground that their experience and knowledge, gained in constructing the existing subway, would insure a minimum of cost with a maximum of quality and permanence of the work.